	Application No. 08/286,413	Applicant(s) Morris et al.
Interview Summary	Examiner Randy Gibson	Group Art Unit 2112

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Randy Gibson (Examiner)_   (3) _Seth Nehrbass (App. Rep.)_

(2) _Dean Morris (App.)_   (4) _____

Date of Interview _____ _Feb 10, 1997_ _____

Type: ☒ Telephonic   ☐ Personal (copy is given to   ☐ applicant   ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes   ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

_____

_____

Agreement   ☐ was reached.   ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: _All independent claims._

Identification of prior art discussed:
_n/a_

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
Even if the RF tags had been inexpensive enough to be disposible, no one had thought to encode tare weight on an RF tag attached to a surgical sponge; detecting the tare weight automatically from the RF tag allows the present invention to be more accurate than a machine which simply detects the presence of a sponge where the tare weight is recorded on the package and is entered manually such as the apparatus disclosed by Nosek, or a machine which simply determines the type of sponge from the entry port chosen by the operator, such as Pollock et al. A machine which automatically determines the type of sponge from the RF tag as the sponge is being deposited would eliminate operator error and thus produce a more accurate blood loss tracking system than before. The affidavits submitted are from anesthesiologists who are experts in their field testifying to a long felt need and the inadequacy of any existing device or method to meet this need.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.